

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. Status of the Claims and Explanation of Amendments

By this paper, the title is amended. This amendment is believed to resolve the objection of the March 20, 2006 Office Action at page 2. Applicant notes, however, that the title has been amended to enable the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the public generally to determine quickly from a cursory inspection the nature and gist of the technical disclosure and to aid indexing, classifying and searching. 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b); MPEP § 606.01. This amendment is *not* intended to narrow, limit, alter or otherwise characterize what Applicant regards as the invention. It is, of course, the claims and not the title that defines the invention being claimed.

Claims 1-17 were pending. By this paper, claims 6, 12 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is amended to recite a “reading step,” a “setting step” and a “communication step.” Claims 7 and 13 are similarly amended. In addition, claim 7 is amended to recite “a wireless communication unit.” Support for these claim amendments is found throughout the application as originally filed, including for example at original claims 6, 12 and 15. Claims 4-5, 8-11, 14, and 16-17 are amended to conform with claims 1, 7 and 13. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Claims 7, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because of the recite of the term “outside” in these claims. [3/20/06 Office Action at pp. 2-3]. By this paper, these claims have been amended to avoid the recitation

of that term. These amendments are not made for any substantial reason related to patentability (§§ 102, 103). Withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 13, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0015467 to Noda ("Noda"). [3/20/06 Office Action at pp. 3-9]. In addition, claims 5, 11 and 14 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noda further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0009541 to Sato ("Sato"). [3/20/06 Office Action at pp. 9-14].

B. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-14 and 16-17 Are Patentably Distinct Over Noda And Sato

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-14 and 16-17, which are not anticipated by Noda or obvious over Noda in view of Sato as explained below. Specifically, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“... a registration step of registering, when said wireless communication apparatus is connected to a second apparatus, setting information for said first apparatus in said memory of said wireless communication apparatus by said second apparatus;

a reading step of reading, when said wireless communication apparatus where the setting information has been registered at said registration step is connected to said first apparatus, the setting information from said memory of said wireless communication apparatus by said first apparatus;

a setting step of setting the setting information read at said reading step in said wireless communication unit by said first apparatus; and

a communication step of performing wireless communication by said wireless communication unit in accordance with the setting information set

in said setting step, whereby the wireless communication by said first apparatus is achieved.”

Noda is directed to a communication device. The office action contends that Noda’s access-point device (3) corresponds to the “first apparatus” recited in Applicant’s claim 1, that Noda’s personal computer (1) corresponds to the “second apparatus” recited in Applicant’s claim 1 and that the wireless communication unit (20) corresponds to the “wireless communication apparatus” recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

Noda discloses that “[b]efore forming a wireless link with the access-point device 3,” certain information “must be set in a wireless communication unit 20 of the personal computer 1.” (Noda, paragraph [0050] (emphasis added); see also Noda, abstract). Noda’s figure 4 is a flowchart showing processing for setting an access-point, executed by the personal computer (1). In a step S3, the IC-card contactless communication unit (19) reads information recorded in the IC card (2). (Noda, paragraph [0065]). The personal computer’s CPU (11) then sets configuration of the wireless communication unit (20) according to that information. (Noda, paragraph [0065]). Only then does the personal computer (1) establish a wireless link with the access-point device (3). (Noda, paragraph [0065]). Thus, Noda discloses that certain information is exchanged between an IC card (2) before the wireless link may be established, and not after that link is established.

The office action argued the above “registration step” is disclosed in Noda’s paragraph 78 and 80. Noda’s paragraph 78 describes that, when a user requests a wireless link be established, a computer (1-1) records local-network information in an IC card (2):

“The personal computer 1-1 starts processing when a user performs an operation for requesting that local-network information required for the personal computer 1-2 to form a

wireless link with the personal computer 1-1 be recorded in the IC card 2.”

Likewise, Noda’s paragraph 80 again describes that local network information is recorded in the IC Card (2):

“[W]hen the user places the IC card 2 in proximity to the IC-card contactless communication unit 19-1 of the personal computer 1-1, the IC-card contactless communication unit 19-1 detects the IC card 2, and the processing proceeds to step S12. In step S12, the IC-card contactless communication unit 19-1 records the local-network information required for the personal computer 1-2 to form a wireless link with the personal computer 1-1 in the IC card 2.”

Thus, Noda’s paragraphs 78 and 80 do not teach, disclose or suggest anything relating to the wireless communication unit (20), which is alleged to correspond to the “wireless communication apparatus recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

Accordingly, Noda fails to teach, disclose or suggest “a registration step of registering, when said wireless communication apparatus is connected to a second apparatus, setting information for said first apparatus in said memory of said wireless communication apparatus by said second apparatus” as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

The office action further asserted that Noda discloses a reading step recited in Applicant’s claim 1. In support of this assertion, the office action cited to paragraphs 84-85. Those paragraphs of Noda describe Noda’s steps S21-S23. In those steps, the IC-card (2) is detected; it is determined whether access point information is recorded in the IC card (2); and, if so, a wireless LAN is formed between the personal computer (1-1) and the personal computer (1-2) in ad-hoc mode. (Noda, ¶¶ 84-85). Steps S21 and S23 do not relate to reading of information at all.

As to step S22, at best, it suggests that the IC-card contactless communication unit (19-2) reads certain information from the IC card (2). This step has nothing whatsoever to do with the wireless communication unit (20), which is alleged by the office action to correspond to the “wireless communication apparatus” of Applicant’s claim 1, or to do with the access point device (3), which is alleged by the office action to correspond to the “first apparatus” of Applicant’s claim 1.

Moreover, the timing of Noda’s step S22 differs. Noda’s step S22 occurs only when the IC-card (2) is detected. This has no bearing on whether the wireless communication unit (20) is connected to the access point device (3).

Accordingly, Noda also fails to teach, disclose or suggest “a reading step of reading, when said wireless communication apparatus ... is connected to said first apparatus, the setting information from said memory of said wireless communication apparatus by said first apparatus” as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

The office action cited to the secondary reference, Sato, to alleviate certain admitted deficiencies in Noda with regard to then-pending claims 5, 11 and 14. The office action did not contend that Sato taught, disclosed or suggested the “registration step” and the “reading step” recited in Applicant’s claim 1. Applicant’s own review of Sato finds no such disclosure.

Accordingly, as Applicant cannot find the “registration step” or the “reading step” of claim 1 in either Noda or Sato, at least independent claims 1, 13 and 17 are respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance. For at least similar reasons, independent claims 7 and 16 and dependent claims 2-5, 8-11 and 14 also are respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 1'0/713,180
Paper dated June 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated March 20, 2006

CONCLUSION


For the above-stated reasons, this application is respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable examination on the merits is requested. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate the examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL FEES WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED FOR THE TIMELY CONSIDERATION OF THIS AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 AND 1.17, OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 13-4500, ORDER NO. 1232-5208.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 20, 2006

By:



Matthew K. Blackburn
Registration No. 47,428

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile